

City of Springboro
320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio 45066

Planning Commission Work Session
Wednesday, November 14, 2007, 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the November 14, 2007 Work Session to order.

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Chairperson, Jim Chmiel, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld, Becky Hartle

Staff: Dan Boron, Planning Consultant; Elmer Dudas, Assistant City Engineer; Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary

II. Agenda Items

- A. Final Development Plan, Southeast corner Clearcreek-Franklin Road and Whispering Pines, Otterbein Neighborhood at Springboro, PUD-B, Planned Unit Development-Business, nursing home

Background

This agenda item is a request filed by Jill Hreben, Otterbein Retirement Communities, represented by Adam Hoff, R.D. Zande and Associates, consulting engineers, for Final Development Plan approval for the construction of a 50-bed nursing home complex on a 5.5-acre (approximately) site near the southeast corner of Clearcreek-Franklin Road and Whispering Pines.

The 5.5-acre site is zoned PUD-B, Planned Unit Development-Business. Rezoning to PUD-B and the General Plan for the 5.5-acre site were approved by City Council on October 4, 2007 following a recommendation from the Planning Commission in August.

As indicated in the application and drawings submitted to the City of Springboro, the applicants intend to develop a 50-bed nursing home complex consisting of five (5) ten-bed houses. Access to the site would be provided by the proposed road on the south side of the site (referred to as Otter Farm Road on the plans and in the remainder of these staff comments).

Adjacent land uses include single-family residential to the north along Whispering Pines Boulevard, within the Tamarack subdivision, and to the west along Clearcreek-Franklin Road. A portion of the single-family residential area to the west is located in Franklin Township. Vacant land, comprising the balance of the Eastbrook Farm property, a 77.6-acre undeveloped parcel fronting West Central Avenue, is located to the south and east. The 5.5-acre site comprising the proposed nursing home facility was split from the Eastbrook Farm.

Adjacent zoning includes R-2 District to the north (Tamarack subdivision); (T)R-1, Franklin Township Rural Residence to the west within Franklin Township and PUD-R, Planned Unit Development-Residential. R-2 and O-2 zoning to the east; and O-2 District to the south.

Final Development Plan review and approval by the Planning Commission is the second step of the three-step PUD approval process. Following Final Development Plan, review and approval of the Record Plan by Planning Commission and City Council is required.

Consolidated Staff Comments

1. Please indicate all existing trees to remain and in particular trees in excess of five inches (5") diameter at breast height (dbh) per the requirements of Chapter 280 of the Codified Ordinances, Tree Authority.
2. Please indicate the proposed location of the dumpster pad(s), if any, and proposed screening.
3. Please indicate the manner in which the pedestrian access will be provided from the site to the proposed access road and Clearcreek-Franklin Road.
4. Following Planning Commission review at the November 14th Work Session please prepare a landscaping plan indicating existing vegetation to remain, proposed landscaping including number of specimens, location and size.
5. Following Planning Commission review at the November 14th Work Session, please prepare a lighting plan per the requirements of Section 1271.02 (Exterior Lighting).
6. Please provide a color rendering—one copy clipmounted on a board is sufficient—of the proposed building and/or proposed exterior building materials at the November 14th Work Session. Following review by Planning Commission a color record copy needs to be submitted to City staff.
7. Please be advised that Section 1271.03 (Exterior Façade Design Standards) prohibits the use of vinyl siding as indicated on sheets A2-3, B2-3, C2-3, D2-3 and E2-3. Residential-scale brick, stone, natural and wood-based materials, EIFS above the pedestrian grade and Hardiplank or Hardiboard are permitted.
8. Please indicate at the November 14th Work Session the relationship between the proposed buildings (e.g., A, B, etc.) and the proposed site plan.
9. Please coordinate with Ron Gibboney, Zoning Inspector, (937) 748-9791, regarding signage that may be proposed for individual buildings and overall development.
10. Provide erosion and sediment control measures on the plan for review.
11. The parking lot and circulation aisle shall meet the off-street parking requirements as stated in Section 1271.04 of the Planning and Zoning code.
12. Occupancy Permit will not be issued until the public improvements along the proposed Otter Farm Boulevard are constructed and the record plan approved by the city.
13. Provide the documents for the 10-foot utility easement on both sides of the Otter Farm Boulevard.
14. Provide Otter Farm Boulevard design plans and record plan, including the developed lot and right-of-way.
15. Provide site plan details per Chapter 1280 of the Planning and Zoning Code, including water main, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and detention design.
16. Provide retaining wall design.
17. Provide documentation for the offsite detention basin easement.
18. The three-lane access drive shown in the southeast corner of the lot should be shown as a two-lane access drive.
19. Provide parking lot typical section.

Adam Hoff of R.D. Zande and Associates and Jill Hreben of Otterbein Retirement Communities were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Hoff apologized for any confusion regarding the submission requirements. Some details may have been omitted from the plans and updated plans will be submitted before the next Planning Commission meeting. The lighting and landscaping plans will be submitted at that time.

Mr. Hoff asked for a clarification regarding marking the existing trees in excess of five-inch diameter. He asked whether the trees on the entire site would need to be indicated or only those that would not be affected by the clearing of the property. He explained that the landscaping on the exterior of the land would be preserved to maintain the screening from the homes to the north.

Mr. Boron explained that the trees on the periphery that will not be affected by the locations of the buildings need to be marked.

Mr. Hoff commented that the plans call for a residential feel so the buildings will use trashcans and not a dumpster. A hauler contracted by Otterbein will pick up trash.

Ms. Ridd asked about the number of trashcans that will be used.

Ms. Hreben answered that there will be three cans per building to be kept within the building near the service entrance to each building.

Mr. Hoff commented that the name "Otter Farm Boulevard" would be changed.

Mr. Hoff commented that the intent for the site is to provide sidewalks along both sides of the entry drive, not from the site out to those sidewalks. The concern is for the safety of residents with dementia who may unintentionally follow the sidewalks to the street.

Mr. Hoff presented color photographs of current buildings in lieu of color renderings and reviewed the colors and uses of the buildings. Copies are included in the record.

Mr. Hoff asked for a discussion of the use of vinyl siding, which is prohibited under the design standards. He explained that Otterbein wants to maintain a residential environment. He commented that the code has an exemption for certain residential uses. He proposed the use of natural stone and brick with the use of vinyl siding and wood trim in keeping with the residential feel.

Mr. Landefeld commented that Hardiplank makes an appropriate material.

Ms. Hreben commented that the homes are Medicaid certified and made to be efficient; Otterbein needs to keep costs down. She added that the buildings would look like large houses and the proposed colors could match those used in the Tamarack subdivision. She explained that Otterbein has designed a residential model to fit into commercial building uses and codes.

Mr. Landefeld explained that an exemption granted for one project could be used as leverage in another project. He added that the code is in place for a reason.

Ms. Ridd asked whether the fronts of the buildings could be finished with something other than vinyl.

Ms. Hreben commented that these designs were used in Middletown and a compromise was reached to use Hardiplank on the fronts of the buildings.

Ms. Gibson asked staff for an opinion as to whether Planning Commission could grant a variance.

Mr. Boron commented that the PUD designation allows for a very small degree of latitude, with exceptions for residential uses, but that is at Planning Commission's discretion

Ms. Belpulsi commented that should the Planning Commission make exceptions for one project, they then must make exceptions for all. She added that this project is a business even though it is within an overall residential project.

Mr. Hoff commented that he would work with Mr. Gibboney regarding the signage; plans call for only one entry sign, not signs at each house.

Mr. Hoff commented that the other staff comments would be addressed in the more detailed and amended plans to be presented.

Mr. Hoff added that the detailed plans would be prepared for presentation at the January Planning Commission meeting.

B. Site Plan Review, 365 North Main Street, dental office

Background

This agenda item is a request filed by James Gehring, agent, representing Dr. Adel Hanna, DDS, property owner, for Site Plan Review approval to allow the construction of an 11,126-square foot medical/dental and general office building at 365 North Main Street. The 1.1-acre property is located near the west corner of the intersection of North Main Street (SR 741) and McCray Boulevard.

The site at 365 North Main Street is zoned O-R, Office-Residential District, a zoning category that permits the proposed use. The proposed site of the office building presently contains a single-family residence.

Adjacent land uses include office to the north; single-family residential (on the east side of North Main Street) in the McCray Farms subdivision to the east; office to the south; and single-family residential to the west.

Adjacent zoning includes O-R District to the north and south; PUD to the east (McCray Farms) and R-2, Low Density Residential District to the west.

Consolidated Staff Comments

1. Applicant is advised that site plan prohibits the future conversion of office space other than that proposed at the present from general to medical/dental, which has a higher off-street parking requirement without the benefit of a joint parking arrangement with nearby property.
2. Following Planning Commission review at the November 14th Work Session, please prepare a lighting plan per the requirements of Section 1271.02 (Exterior Lighting).
3. Please provide a color rendering of the proposed building and/or proposed exterior building materials at the November 14th Work Session.
4. Please coordinate with Ron Gibboney, Zoning Inspector, (937) 748-9791, regarding signage that may be proposed for the buildings and site.

5. Please coordinate with Kenny Smith, Public Work Department, (937) 748-9791, regarding proposed demolition of existing structures on the property.
6. Following Planning Commission review at the November 14th Work Session please prepare a landscaping plan indicating existing vegetation to remain, proposed landscaping including number of specimens, location and size and screening of parking from adjacent residential uses.
7. Provide 35-foot Public Access Easement for the frontage along North Main Street (SR 741) per 1280.08(a)(2) of the Planning and Zoning Code.
8. Following review at the November 14th Work Session, provide site plan details per Chapter 1280 of the Planning and Zoning Code, including water main, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and detention design.
9. Provide parking lot typical section and curb type.
10. Provide erosion control plans.
11. Provide retaining wall design.
12. Provide details on the sidewalk/curb and gutter removal and replacement along North Main Street following the November 14th Work Session review.
13. Disconnect the water service to the property to the north. Only one service is permitted from the existing water tap.
14. Provide separate sanitary sewer construction drawings, along with sanitary sewer easement.

James Gehring, Gehring Construction, and Adel Hanna, property owner, were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

The parking lot requirements were reviewed. Mr. Boron explained that the first staff comment is simply to make the applicant aware that should a future owner wish to use the whole building for medical/dental offices as opposed to general offices, the amount of parking lot spaces would be insufficient.

Mr. Gehring reviewed the plans and layout of the property. He explained the reasons for the layout of the parking lots in relation to the uses for the building.

Mr. Gehring commented that the landscaping plan would be provided before the next Planning Commission meeting. He reviewed the preliminary plans for landscaping, with low screening along SR 741 and along the sides of the property adjacent to the businesses on each side. He reviewed the existing vegetation along the rear of the property and the need for screening and buffering. He identified the retention pond for the property and reviewed its design.

For the lighting plan, Mr. Gehring proposed two 10-foot poles with post lights. He felt there would be no need to light the parking lot since the businesses do not have evening hours. The lighting plan will be presented prior to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Papakirk asked about the location of the detention pond. He reviewed the landscaping with Mr. Gehring to identify trees to remain. Mr. Papakirk asked that they be identified on the next set of plans. Mr. Gehring agreed that they would be.

Mr. Landefeld commented that this side of Main Street is a blend into the old part of Springboro and the setbacks on the rest of the buildings are much closer to the road. His preference would be to see the building moved farther forward on the lot to match the existing buildings on each side.

Mr. Gehring commented that moving the building would cause the need to reduce the size of the building, would not work with the natural topography of the site and would result in the loss of ten

parking spaces. He explained that the building was placed where it is to maximize the square footage of the building.

Ms. Ridd asked Mr. Gehring whether he was concerned about the visibility of the building from State Route 741.

Mr. Gehring reviewed the proposed elevations. He commented that he felt that visibility would not be a problem. He explained that the original plans had called for the building to be closer to the road but due to the 35 foot buffer zone the building was moved back.

Mr. Landefeld commented that he would prefer that the building not be in the back with the parking lot in the front and that the building match up with the existing buildings on each side.

Mr. Papakirk agreed with Mr. Landefeld but added that should the building be moved up the site would need to be graded with retaining walls.

Dr. Hanna commented that the parking was arranged to accommodate his patients that would need his building to be handicapped accessible.

Mr. Chmiel agreed with Mr. Landefeld and commented that when the property to the south develops that their parking should not also be in the front. He asked Mr. Gehring to explore any options available to keep as much of the parking as possible off of the road.

Mr. Gehring explained that Dr. Hanna needs the spaces in front of the building near the entry for his business.

Ms. Belpulsi asked about an entry for handicapped parking from the lower lot.

Mr. Gehring explained that there would be not an interior connection or elevator to allow patients to enter the rear of the building and access Dr. Hanna's office. Patients would need to go around to building and enter from the front.

Mr. Landefeld asked for the grade on the side driveway.

Mr. Gehring answered that it is 8 feet of slope over fifty feet.

Ms. Hartle asked whether more landscaping could be done to hide the parking lot.

Mr. Gehring answered that that would not be a problem.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether there would be handicapped parking in the back.

Mr. Gehring answered that there would be one space on the lower level. Two spaces are required and two will be on the upper level with an additional one on the lower level.

Mr. Landefeld asked whether there would be any interior connection between the floors.

Mr. Gehring answered that the floors will be connected a stairway.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for further questions from the Planning Commission. There were none.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Gehring to return to Planning Commission with more detailed plans and landscaping details regarding the parking lot areas.

Mr. Gehring presented samples of the proposed materials including stone, brick, EFIS and the shingles.

Mr. Boron informed Mr. Gehring of the submission dates for the December Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Gehring asked about the tie in of water by Mr. Music's building to the north.

Staff will follow up on the issue.

C. Preliminary Final Development Plan, Village Park PUD-MU, Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use, Office Component

Background Information

This agenda item is a request submitted by Greg Martin of Village Park Office Commons, LLC, property owners, for preliminary review of the majority of the office component of the Village Park Planned Unit Development-Mixed Use (PUD-MU). The Village Park PUD-MU is located on the southwest corner of North Main Street (SR 741) and Pennyroyal Road.

This proposed project was last reviewed by the Planning Commission at the February 14, 2007 Work Session. The purpose of this Work Session review is to acquaint members of the Planning Commission with the new development team on the project and to provide for a preliminary review of the manner in which the office component of the Village Park PUD-MU, the largest land area within the PUD-MU, will be developed so that the office park's later review can be done so in a coordinated fashion. As such the nature of staff comments below, with the exception of Clearcreek Fire District comments, are general in nature.

The area that is the subject of this request is approximately 22.63 acres of land on the west side of the proposed Gardner Road extending from Pennyroyal Road on the north to Anna Drive on the south. Approximately 9.34 acres of the proposed office area is located north of Village Park Boulevard; the remaining 13.29 acres is located to the south.

The office component of the Village Park PUD-MU was approved as part of the General Plan for the PUD in 2004. Other office space, located on the southwest corner of Pennyroyal Road at North Main Street (SR 741) is not subject to this review/approval request.

Adjacent land uses to the proposed office area include: to the west, a city park and the residential component of the Village Park PUD-MU; to the north a low-density residential uses north of Pennyroyal Road in Clearcreek Township; office and retail uses proposed as part of the Village Park PUD-MU to the east; and to the south the Easton Farm.

As indicated in the submitted site plans, a total of 280,000 square foot of office space is proposed for a total of 15 office buildings ranging in size from 8,000 to 22,000 to 32,000 square feet. A total of 134,000 square feet of office is proposed in five (5) buildings located on the north side of Village Park Boulevard; 146,000 square feet of office is proposed in ten (10) buildings located on the south side of Village Park Boulevard.

Staff Comments

1. A pattern book for the office component needs to be prepared, following review at the November 14th Work Session, outlining proposed building design, streetscape and other project design details—for example, lighting, landscaping, signage—for subsequent review of individual sites/buildings. Please coordinate with Dan Boron, Planning Consultant, at (937) 748-6183, for more information.
2. Following review at the November 14th Work Session, and as part of the pattern book comment mentioned above, prepare a landscaping plan that indicates (if any) existing vegetation to remain and the number, size and type of planting material to be installed. The landscape plan should address issues discussed previously with the Planning Commission regarding this project including (1) the means to buffer between the proposed office development and the multi-family residential area to the west, (2) the large parking area along the Pennyroyal Road frontage and (3) primary and secondary entrances to the overall office development.
3. The right-of-ways for all public streets fronting the office development are to be dedicated, and all public improvements constructed before any additional individual final development plans are to be approved by the planning commission.
4. Provide association documents to be reviewed by the City. Occupancy permits will not be issued until the documents have been approved by the City and then recorded.
5. Extend Anna Drive to the south property line.
6. Provide the lot lines and acreage breakdown of each lot and how the overall development will be phased. The minimum lot size is 2 acres and the maximum lot size is 8 acres.
7. The following Clearcreek Fire District comments pertain to the portion of the office park south of Village Park Boulevard):
 - a. Each building shall be equipped with a Knox Key Box, Contact the Clearcreek Fire District to discuss the purchase and locations of the key boxes.
 - b. A fire hydrant must be located at least 40' and within 75' of the fire department sprinkler connection for building 11 and be approved by the Clearcreek Fire District.
 - c. A fire hydrant must be located at least 40' and within 75' of the fire department sprinkler connection for any building equipped with a sprinkler system. The location of all hydrants shall be approved by the Clearcreek Fire District.
 - d. All buildings equipped with a fire alarm system shall provide a remote annunciator in the main entrance of each building.
 - e. Parking spaces may be eliminated to insure access to fire department sprinkler connections.
8. The following Clearcreek Fire District comments pertain to the portion of the office park north of Village Park Boulevard):
 - a. Each building shall be equipped with a Knox Key Box, Contact the Clearcreek Fire District to discuss the purchase and locations of the key boxes.
 - b. A fire hydrant must be located at least 40' and within 75' of the fire department sprinkler connection for any building equipped with a sprinkler system. The location of all hydrants shall be approved by the Clearcreek Fire District.
 - c. All buildings equipped with a fire alarm system shall provide a remote annunciator in the main entrance of each building.
 - d. Parking spaces may be eliminated to insure access to fire department sprinkler connections.

Dan Fishbaugh of Fishbaugh & Sons, Greg Martin of Martin Excavating and Tom Streiff of Apex Engineering were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Greg Martin, managing member, spoke of behalf of Village Park Office Commons LLC. He introduced his partners as Dan Fishbaugh of Fishbaugh & Sons, Larry Colclasier, paving contractor and Roy Smith, real estate agent and explained the group's history and plans for Village Park.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Martin whether he had had a chance to review the staff comments.

Mr. Martin responded to the staff comments. A pattern book will be prepared. Mr. Martin explained the landscaping plan in regards to the entrances. Mr. Martin commented that the plats are not dedicated, but that will be accomplished before approval.

Mr. Martin commented that it was his understanding that Anna Drive was already extended to the property line. He asked Mr. Dudas about the urgency of completion of the street. Mr. Dudas answered that the street would need to be platted.

Mr. Martin asked about the fire hydrant locations and fire department comments. At this point plans call for four of the buildings to require sprinklers and that the other buildings would be sized below the code requirements for sprinklers. While a builder might want to have a sprinkler system in the building at this point, Mr. Martin is unable to plan for the number of hydrants.

Mr. Boron explained that the fire department comments are more detailed at this point than the remainder of the staff comments.

Mr. Boron reviewed the history of this property for the Planning Commission. He explained that the General Plan for this property was approved in 2004 as part of step one of the PUD approval process. Due to the size of the site, staff would like to address common themes such as access, utilities and other areas that need to be dealt with before final development plans are approved on a phased basis. Yet to be provided is a phasing plan and pattern book for the site. This work session meeting has been scheduled to allow for the new team to meet with the Planning Commission, discuss general items and give staff a chance to provide direction. Individual buildings may come in as final development plans, but staff would like to develop a general concept to transition from the general plan to individual final development plans.

Mr. Martin explained that the team's intent is to develop a campus feel with a traditional look and Class A office space. Brick and siding colors will be consistent throughout. There may be variance in the larger buildings, but a consistent look will be maintained. Buildings may have small differences but the overall architectural style will remain the same.

Mr. Chmiel raised the issue of continuity when it comes to the availability of similar building materials for buildings that are completed years apart. Developers have requested variances due to the cost and availability of materials. He asked that should a material such as brick not be available a similar material be chosen.

Mr. Chmiel also raised the issue of tenants who may wish to establish their corporate themes.

Mr. Martin commented that any variances would conflict with their vision and desire for a consistent look. Slight variances will be allowed, but major changes would change the vision they are trying to accomplish and not be acceptable.

Ms. Ridd commented that many times the issue has been the request by the builder is use a material that looks like the sample in the patternbook but that is less expensive.

Mr. Martin commented that the site would be developed in phases to control the development and the number of Planning Commission applications.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that an office park should not present the same branding issue as retail development.

Mr. Fishbaugh commented that their group had discussed having company logos on the buildings that will match in size and color.

Ms. Belpulsi agreed, and referred to the IGA Plaza where the different businesses have conformed to a uniform look.

Mr. Landefeld asked whether any buildings would be completed as spec buildings.

Mr. Martin commented that the group plans to maintain ownership of about half of the property, but is open to the sale of more of the property. He added that that he likes the consistent look and would like to choose an overall identity for the site.

Ms. Ridd asked how the common area maintenance and open space would be affected now that the retail portion of the site is separate from the office portion of the site.

Mr. Martin explained that the open space would be under Village Park office management.

Mr. Martin commented that building footprints are fairly precise but the group will be flexible in response to customer needs.

Mr. Chmiel asked Mr. Boron if there were any mobility issues between the retail and residential buildings in terms of walkways. He asked if there were any concerns that needed to be addressed by Planning Commission.

Mr. Boron responded that the plans were not discussed in detail but that there would be sidewalks on the dedicated roads of Gardner Road and Village Park Drive with sidewalks on both sides and east-west sidewalks connecting to the residential part of the site. Internally the sidewalks have not been discussed yet.

Mr. Papakirk agreed that the sidewalks are an important feature in order to emphasize the park feel of "Village Park" and keep the synergy between all of the uses, with connectivity and a unified look so that the office building work with what is next to them and they look coordinated and unified.

Mr. Martin commented that the group is interested in having a clear understanding of any issues from the Planning Commission of what will work in order to be prepared for customers interested in the site.

Mr. Landefeld added that one concept that Planning Commission tried to work into the previous plan was a bike trail north-south through this site. A preference would be for it to be between the residential and office park. The trail would not just be within the development but would extend north-south beyond it. The preference is to locate it to the west in the site and not along SR 741 due to the curb cuts and away from vehicular traffic.

Mr. Landefeld commented on the amount of parking provided; 933 spaces are required and 1162 are provided. This would be more than 25% more than necessary. He asked why there was so much parking provided.

Mr. Fishbaugh responded the difference comes between the minimum needed and the amount needed for medical uses. The amount of parking allows for a variety of uses of the buildings that will meet the demands.

Mr. Streiff commented that some parking spaces might be lost to the fire department's request for more fire hydrants.

Ms. Ridd commented that the parking could be adjusted as the owners are identified but the group should be aware that parking is something that the Planning Commission is concerned about.

Mr. Fishbaugh commented that owners might come and go so the group is planning for future uses.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that these issues could be worked out but that the group and the Planning Commission agree that the goal is a nice village atmosphere, keeping it green as possible.

Ms. Belpulsi asked if there were any other areas on which the group needed directions. There were none.

Mr. Martin added that the group plans to return to the Planning Commission in January with Phase One, which would entail five buildings.

D. Site Plan Review, 2748 Pennyroyal Road, proposed Jehovah's Witnesses Kingdom Hall

Background

This agenda item is a request submitted by Marvin Clark, representing South Miamisburg Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Inc., for Site Plan Review approval to all the construction of a 5,151-square foot building at 2748 Pennyroyal Road. The 3.0-acre site is located northwest of the corner of Pennyroyal Road and Evergreen Drive.

The property at 2748 Pennyroyal Road is zoned Clearcreek Township (T)R-1, a zoning classification that permits the proposed use. At present the property contains a single-family residence.

Adjacent land uses include Clearcreek Chapel to the north; the access drive to Clearcreek Chapel to the east along with large-lot single-family residential; large-lot single-family residential to the west; and single-family residential to the south (Royal Springs subdivision).

Adjacent zoning includes Clearcreek Township (T)R-1 to the north, east and west; and (T)R-1 and R-2, Low Density Residential District to the south.

Staff Comments

1. Please consult with City Staff on an appropriate vicinity map format for the proposed religious facility.

2. Provide at the November 14th Work Session building elevations indicating proposed materials, relative scale and proposed building colors and/or material samples. The elevations should indicate maximum building height and drawn at sufficient scale to allow for staff and Planning Commission review for compliance with Planning and Zoning Code provisions.
3. Section 1271.03, Exterior Façade Design Standards, of the Planning and Zoning Code All building elevations shall be articulated in a manner to avoid an uninterrupted appearance through the use of windows, doors, offsets or a change in materials.
4. Please contact Dan Boron, Planning Consultant, (937) 748-6183, in advance of the meeting with information on the design capacity for the proposed building for the purposes of calculating minimum and maximum off-street parking requirements per Section 1271.04 of the Planning and Zoning Code.
5. Following Planning Commission review at the November 14th Work Session please prepare a landscaping plan indicating existing vegetation to remain, proposed landscaping including number of specimens, location and size and screening of parking from adjacent residential uses.
6. Following Planning Commission review at the November 14th Work Session, please prepare a lighting plan per the requirements of Section 1271.02 (Exterior Lighting). Please note that all lighting to be high-pressure sodium.
7. Please coordinate with Ron Gibboney, Zoning Inspector, (937) 748-9791, regarding signage that may be proposed for the buildings and site.
8. Please coordinate with Kenny Smith, Public Work Department, (937) 748-9791, regarding proposed demolition of existing structures on the property.
9. The parking lot and circulation aisle shall meet the off-street parking requirements as stated in Section 1271.04 of the Planning and Zoning code.
10. Provide site plan details per chapter 1280 of the Planning and Zoning Code, including water main, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and detention design.
11. Provide boundary information.
12. Dedicate the right-of-way along Pennyroyal Road.
13. Provide erosion control details.
14. Relocate the entrance drive to the west end of the property, and make it 24-feet wide.
15. Clearcreek Township Fire District comment: A fire hydrant is required to be placed at an approved location near the building for fire protection. Contact the Clearcreek Fire District to discuss location of the fire hydrant. "No Parking, Fire Lane" signage shall be provided on both sides of the access road to the building, where the access narrows to 20'.

Marvin Clark, representing the building committee of South Miamisburg Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Tom Ludwig, engineer, and Dave Burden, contractor, were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission.

Mr. Clark explained the congregation's need for relocation due to the construction of the new Austin Road Interchange. He invited the Planning Commission to view the actual construction of the Kingdom Hall, which will take two or three days.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Mr. Clark if he had had the opportunity to review the staff comments and to comment on any items that he needed to be clarified.

Mr. Clark will meet with Mr. Boron regarding the vicinity map. He has spoken with Ken Smith of the City's Public Works Department concerning the demolition and will meet him to cap the sewer. Regarding the site plan details, no final details are available but the plans will be completed.

Mr. Ludwig asked about the dedication of the right-of-way along Pennyroyal Road and if the dedication is 40' from the center line and for the procedure for the dedication.

Mr. Dudas answered that it will be included on the record plan to be approved by City Council and recorded with Warren County.

Mr. Ludwig asked whether the record plan would be submitted with the site plan.

Mr. Dudas answered that it is generally a condition of approval and the occupancy permit is held until the record plan is taken care of. He added that it does not have to be done right away but will need to be done before occupancy.

Mr. Clark asked about the fire hydrant comment. He noted that there is a fire hydrant located across the street from the driveway and asked if that would be sufficient.

Ms. Gibson asked for the length of the driveway.

Mr. Ludwig answered that it is 150 feet.

Mr. Boron commented that staff would defer to the fire department on this issue then it comes to the building permit.

Mr. Clark commented that the driveway was moved in response to the staff comments. He added that the Kingdom Hall was located on the back of the property due to the pond on the property.

Ms. Ridd asked if it was an engineering comment to move the driveway.

Mr. Dudas answered that originally the proposal was to share the driveway with Clearcreek Chapel.

Ms. Ridd added that having the drive on the east side would put the driveways too close together.

Mr. Boron commented that the site plan is much different than what was originally proposed to Planning Commission. The original parking lot straddled the building and the building was much closer to Pennyroyal Road.

Mr. Clark commented that the parking lot was moved to preserve the residential feel of the property.

Ms. Ridd commented that she was concerned about the two driveways being so close on Pennyroyal.

Mr. Clark explained that because both buildings are religious institutions that there was a concern about a conflict with high traffic patterns at the same time at both locations. He has done some informal traffic reviews and does not anticipate any problems. He also commented that the driveway relocation would take some of the trees out.

Ms. Belpulsi asked if a joint driveway was considered.

Mr. Boron answered that staff asked the applicants about a joint driveway initially but they have indicated that was not their preference.

Ms. Gibson asked about the timing of the other church's services.

Mr. Clark stated that he does not know; they have not compared schedules. He added that his church's high traffic hours are Tuesday and Thursday evenings, Saturday mornings and Sunday mornings and afternoons.

Ms. Gibson asked that the issue be reviewed by the traffic engineer to insure that a hazard is not being created. She is concerned about sight problems on Pennyroyal Road.

Ms. Ridd commented that she does not feel that there is a sight problem, but there is a tight turn in and out due to the narrow road.

Ms. Belpulsi asked why the drive was moved from the east to the west.

Mr. Clark answered that the existing driveway is located to the east.

Possible locations for the drive were discussed taking into account the location of the Clearcreek Chapel driveway and the detention pond.

Ms. Ridd stated that she felt that the driveway needs to be located as far away from the Clearcreek Chapel driveway as possible.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that if trees need to be removed in order to make the driveway safer than that must occur.

Ms. Belpulsi asked the applicants and Planning Commission member if they have any further questions or comments. There were none.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that it has been a policy of the City that it is preferred that properties be under City zoning. This zoning is township. She asked that the applicants considered applying under City zoning because it is difficult to administer zoning that is not the City's. The rezoning could be done concurrently and fees could be waived.

Mr. Clark stated that he understands the problem and is agreeable to the rezoning as long as the use of the property would remain the same.

Staff will work with Mr. Clark to complete the process.

Mr. Clark presented a picture of the proposed building and material samples.

Ms. Gibson asked about the staff comment that addresses avoiding an uninterrupted appearance.

Mr. Clark explained that the architect is not in attendance to comment, but stone may be added to the elevations.

Mr. Boron commented that formal approval could be completed at the December 12th meeting with submission due November 30th. A new plot plan will be presented and the rezoning process will begin.

Mr. Boron will advise the applicant concerning the date and time of the December meeting as it may change. He advised that the architectural plans and site plan would be due by the submission date.

III. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments.

IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Ms. Boytim polled the Planning Commission members to determine who would be attending the Miami Valley Planning and Zoning Workshop. Ms. Boytim will register Mr. Landefeld, Mr. Papakirk and Ms. Gibson for the workshop.

Ms. Belpulsi asked Planning Commission members for their input concerning rescheduling the December 12th Planning Commission meeting to Tuesday, December 11th due to a conflict with an event with the Warren County Municipal League that some Planning Commission members would be attending. The Planning Commission members agreed that it would be best to reschedule the meeting. The meeting will be rescheduled to Tuesday, December 11th with the work session beginning at 6:00 p.m. and the regular meeting beginning at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Boron reported that no submissions have been received for the November 28th regular meeting. Planning Commission agreed to cancel the meeting due to the lack of agenda items.

Ms. Ridd presented an article on the Austin Road Interchange that was in B to B, a magazine published by the Dayton Daily News. All Planning Commission members will receive a copy of the article.

V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, November 14, 2007 Work Session at 9:02 P.M.

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chair

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary